

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney  
2 ARIN C. HEINZ  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
4 Telephone: (559) 497-4080  
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099  
5  
6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

7  
8  
9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
12  
13 Plaintiff,  
14 v.  
15 JONATHAN LOPEZ,  
16 Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00291-JLT-SKO

**STIPULATION TO CONTINUE STATUS  
CONFERENCE AND EXCLUDE TIME  
ORDER**

17 **BACKGROUND**

18 This case is set for status conference on September 6, 2023. The Supreme Court has emphasized  
19 that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive openendedness with  
20 procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United*  
21 *States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under” §  
22 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United*  
23 *States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-  
24 of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

25 Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the  
26 basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the  
27 public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is  
28 excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or

finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

In light of the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

### STIPULATION

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order, this matter was set for a status conference on September 6, 2023.
2. By this stipulation, the defendant moves to continue this matter to November 15, 2023, and to exclude time between September 6, 2023, and November 15, 2023 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4].
3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:
  - a) The government provided discovery to the defense on November 18, 2022. The discovery consists of numerous recorded jailhouse phone calls, investigative reports, photographs, and other information.
  - b) On November 29, 2022, new counsel for the defendant was appointed. New counsel for defendant desires additional time to consult with her client, review the discovery, and conduct an independent investigation. Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny him/her the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
  - c) The Government provided a plea offer to defense counsel. The parties are actively discussing the plea offer and the parties best estimated guidelines calculation for Mr. Lopez. Defense counsel requests additional to evaluate the offer and to engage in further negotiations.
  - d) Mr. Lopez’s sister is currently terminally ill. Defense counsel is currently evaluating

whether to request that Mr. Lopez be released to attend her funeral or visit with his sister.

Defense counsel requests additional time to evaluate the circumstances related to this.

e) The government does not object to the continuance.

f) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

g) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from September 6, 2023 to November 15, 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: August 28, 2023

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney

/s/ ARIN C. HEINZ  
ARIN C. HEINZ  
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: August 28, 2023

/s/ CHRISTINA M. CORCORAN  
Christina M. Corcoran  
Counsel for Defendant  
Jonathan Lopez

**ORDER**

The parties shall be prepared to select a mutually agreeable trial date at the next status conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 9/1/2023

*Sheila K. Oberto*

---

THE HONORABLE SHEILA K. OBERTO  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE